Correspondence

A FAIRIE'S REPLY TO DR LICHTENSTEIN

To the Editor: Since I am one of the fairies whom Dr P. M. LICHTENSTEIN, prison physician of the New York City Tombs, describes in his excellent article in your August issue, and since I am perhaps the best authority in the United States on androgynism, having associated with fairies to a greater extent than any other writer, I request space for a few words in reply. My full reply is in two books: my 70,000-word 'Autobiography of an Androgyne,' published three years ago by the *Medico-Legal Journal,* and my second work on ultra-androgynism, to be published this winter by the same journal, the 65,000-word 'The Female Impersonators.'

I feel deeply grateful to Dr LICHTENSTEIN for his words of sympathy for these most misunderstood and bitterest persecuted of human beings. But in some respects he unintentionally misrepresents the fairie or ultra-androgyne.

In mentioning one having a syphilitic rash he says: 'The fairie is as great a menace as the prostitute.' But the fairie is not nearly so commonly attacked by venereal disease. I fancy it is because the saliva tends to kill the germs. I had an intensive fairie career for twelve years before contracting syphilis, and did not contract gonorrhea until another twelve of moderate promiscuity. In the earlier period at least one-half and in the later all my companions were young roués belonging to the two occupations, proverbial sufferers from venereal diseases. The solitary onset of gonorrhea lasted about three weeks. It affected only the throat below the uvula, as if the saliva were a protection for the mouth. I had three onsets of buccal syphilis, together aggregating not more than five weeks. Only during these eight weeks out of a fairie career of twenty-four years could I have inoculated a companion, and I abstained for fear of it. For, in my fairie career I always observed the rule: 'Do unto others as you would they should do to you.' Doubtless a sufferer can know of the existence of venereal disease in the mouth or throat more readily than in the interior pudenda. This is one factor that makes the fairie safer than the female *fille de joie.* The syphilitic rash which covered my body several times was not synchronous with the buccal sores. No infection could have been transmitted thru the rash, as the skin was perfectly dry.

Dr LICHTENSTEIN unwittingly creates prejudice in the use of an incorrect term, 'sodomy,' in reference to this first androgyne. But this sexual cripple certainly could not have 'practiced sodomy', which means taking the active part in paedicatio. That is impossible on a sleeper. Moreover, ultra-androgynes are capable of taking only the passive rôle. He doubtless attempted fellatio. Finally, this first androgyne was not a 'fairie,' a term which is restricted to one openly a *fille de joie.* The first androgyne of Dr LICHTENSTEIN'S article apparently never let his secret and irresponsible penchant become known to anybody, having apparently, the habit of hanging around the desk described by the doctor just in order

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

to get ultra-virile young bachelors into his trap. He was not really responsible for the roguery. Nature had put him in a tight place because of the refusal of cultivated man to inquire into androgynism, and imprisoning or making outcasts of his victims regardless of whether the latter deserved such fate. In the unfortunate's perplexity as to how to fulfil the most exacting demands of Nature when his fellow man forbade it (to the androgyne alone), under penalty of imprisonment and the deepest disgrace, the only way out of his predicament that he saw was to *steal* from a sleeper what Nature demanded he should have. Evidently he was an unsophisticated youth who had not had the opportunity of learning the ways of fairies in the metropolis. He was certainly a pitiable greenhorn androgyne. Instead of imprisonment he ought to have been instructed by a physician in the psychology and ethics of androgynism as portrayed in my two books.

Dr LICHTENSTEIN prejudices the androgyne by connecting flagellation with him. The latter is an entirely separate phenomenon, as common per capita among heterosexualists as among homosexualists.

'Homosexualists' is a misnomer for ultra-androgynes, who, as judged by the majority of their secondary sexual determinants, psychic as well as physical, really belong to the opposite sex from their soulmates, while their primary determinants are often subnormal and probably never functional. Thus Dr LICHTENSTEIN speaks of the letter that he quotes: 'The writer was a *man*.' That appellation tends to a misjudgment of that writer. He was only a *pseudo*-man. He was really a woman whom Nature had disguised as a man. As Dr LICHTENSTEIN himself quotes from KRAFFT-EBING: 'They are neither man nor woman; a mixture of both, with secondary psychic and physical characteristics of the one as well as the other sex.'

KRAFFT-EBING believed that the majority of ultra-androgynes or fairies are congenital. Dr LICHTENSTEIN seems not to agree. But he is confuted by his own statement that all the fairies whom he has examined show physical feminine earmarks. If the physique is notably femininesque, that to me is almost certain evidence that the feminine psyche and quasi-feminine method of sexual expression are innate. For the absence of bearded growth, the presence of milk glands, the feminine contour of limbs, commonly present in ultra-androgynes, must be congenital.

Dr LICHTENSTEIN advises that society 'prevent such persons practicing perverted acts.' I disagree. (1) They are impelled to those acts by the strongest of instincts, often irresistible. (2) The acts are absolutely innocuous to their soulmates and to society as a whole. These practices have prevailed thruout the history of mankind. And who can trace any ill effect to them, excepting alone the enfeeblement of the ultra-androgyne's own health? (3) The number addicted is too great for a segregation of these sexual cripples. In our own country, one out of every three hundred possessors of male primary determinants is an ultra-androgyne. In addition, one out of every three hundred is mildly androgynous, or a psychic hermaphrodite. How segregate such vast numbers, including some of our brightest minds and most useful members of society? Mrs HAVELOCK ELLIS, in her 'New Horizons in Love and Life,' says: 'Inversion [sexual] and genius have a sort of affinity.' It is cer-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

tain that genius supervenes upon inversion or androgynism far more often than upon full-fledged sexuality. I could name some of the greatest historic characters who were androgynes, but have not the space here to present the evidence. I describe them in my 'Female Impersonators.'

And would it not be cruel for society to heap despair upon despair on the heads of these already most afflicted of the human race? For sexual crippling is truly the greatest of tragedies, since sexuality is the foremost physiological function.

The word 'perverted' as used by Dr LICHTENSTEIN should be understood as merely a synonym of 'unusual.' For the acts thus described are *natural.* It is the method Nature has prescribed for these, her step-children.

He speaks of these ultra-androgynes as 'a menace to society.' I, in all charity, ask him, or anyone else, to conjure up how they could possibly be such in any way? I have argued the matter at length in my 'Autobiography.' It is only prejudice and bigotry that can suggest the idea, 'menace.' But the esteemed doctor is far more free from these faults than are nine-tenths of other intellectuals.

He hints that masturbation in boyhood may produce in adulthood a fairie or androgyne. I have my doubts. In my physical prime I was a fairie of extreme type. I never masturbated as a child or as an adult because of acute horror. My own pudenda never had any part in my sexual ardor—any more than had my vermiform appendix. Nature indicated for me the buccal cavity as the physical organ in question.

Dr LICHTENSTEIN'S suggestion of the correction by parents of feminine predilections in small boys is futile. I say it without malice, being deeply grateful to the doctor for the extent to which he has enlightened the profession on this most unhappy and most persecuted—and that unjustly—class of mankind, the sexual cripples. Those femininesque traits, when congenital, as I believe they always are in ultra-androgynes, cannot be suppressed. Likewise his advice that the ultra-androgyne 'seek the company of girls' as a cure is as futile. In my teens I forced myself to it, and it did no good.

Finally, I differ from the good doctor when he advises society to 'punish severely the companion of an ultra-androgyne.' That would be highly unjust both to the androgyne and to his soulmate. Why deny to the ultra-androgyne the gratification of the strongest of human instincts, while permitting it to all who are sexually full-fledged? If it be maintained that the race is perpetuated by the latter's functioning, I answer that this consideration would only permit to wedded couples a sex-union when offspring was the object—that is, for an American cultured couple, from one to three times thruout their married life.

And the ultra-androgyne could not have that instinct gratified without the acquiescence of an ultra-virile bachelor. I have learned thru intimacy with nearly a thousand such that whether or not they will go with an androgyne depends not on their moral character, but solely on the degree of their congenital sexual ardor combined with their state of sexual satiety. Some of the most noble-minded ultra-virile young bachelors—angels in disposition and character—have been intimate with me. People who have never come into personal contact with ultra-androgynes think only the scum of the human race could be guilty of the commonly known sex practices of andro-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

gynes. But some of the highest-minded members of society regularly indulge. And the reason is: They are impelled by overpowering instinct.

Expressing my deep gratitude to Dr LICHTENSTEIN, and to the Editor of the MEDICAL REVIEW OF REVIEWS, I am,

Yours for the relief of the oppressed and the betterment of the race,

RALPH WERTHER (JENNIE JUNE).

FAITH AS THE HEALING EMANATION IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

To the Editor: I shall be grateful for the privilege of commenting upon one phase of the interesting article by Dr GOLDSCHMIDT in the MEDICAL REVIEW OF REVIEWS for May, the reference to faith and religious emotion as the healing power in Christian Science.

Christian Science teaches and its students believe that God, divine Mind, is immanent and available thro the Christ, Truth, 'to heal all thy diseases,' including every phase of discord attendant upon the round of human experience; while faith, that is, confidence in the healing agency is a factor; yet understanding, that is knowledge of the truth about God and man, is the true healer. Faith as such, altho unquestionably an agency in the healing of disease, is something quite apart from the operations of Christian Science. The estatic emotion attendant upon the belief that God will heal is quite other than the operation of God as Principle, which destroys in human consciousness the beliefs in discord and sin which are the procuring cause of sickness. To understand God and His creation, including spiritual man, as perfect, eternal, incapable of sin and sickness in itself regenerates human thought by destroying the false beliefs. In 'Retrospection and Introspection,' p. 54, Mrs EDDY has said: 'Millions are believing in God, or good without bearing the fruits of goodness, not having reached its Science. Belief is veritable blindness when it demands faith without understanding.'

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT F. GILMORE.

342 Madison Ave.

The BOOKERY

14 West 47th Street, New York City

THE BOOKERY! What charming visions the word brings to mind! A place where books are sold, indeed, but where the selling of a book is truly secondary to the spirit of comaraderie and good fellowship engendered by a mutual love of books.

A place where the owner is your hostess, where easy chairs invite discussion and where a steaming samovar both soothes and stimulates.

Such a place is **THE BOOKERY,** at **14 West 47th Street,** where all our friends, and all those who would be our friends, will find not only a pleasant, but an interesting welcome.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN